

# Meeting Minutes

## Monthly Status Reporting Revision Working Team

**DAY:** 10/25/06  
**TIME:** 11:00am - Noon  
**LOCATION:** 3900 Conference Room 39A

<b>Meeting Called By:</b>	Gaye Mays		
<b>Meeting Purpose:</b>	Review Current Process & Validate “Top 10”		
<b>Attendees:</b> (* attended by phone) Note: Bob Giannuzzi & Steve Tedder unable to attend. Jim Tulenko has joined our group.	Gaye Mays – EPMO Steve Tedder - EPMO David Butts - Wildlife Resources Commission	Bob Giannuzzi - EPMO Barbara Swartz – Strategic Initiatives Richard McGee – EPMO/QA	Greg Jones – Crime Control Lucy Cornelius – DHHS Manny Zech – DOT Jim Tulenko- Strategic Initiatives
<b>Meeting Documents:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Manny Zech handed out hard copies of the DOT Project Request document and an example list of templates used to manage projects within their agency.</li> <li>Dick McGee handed out an example status report format.</li> </ul>		
<b>Attachments:</b>	N/A		
<b>Next Meeting:</b>	Wednesday 11/1 @ 11am Call-in number 919-754 - 6675		

## Discussion Points

1	<b>Review of DOT Project Management &amp; Status Reporting Process:</b> Manny reviewed the overall project management process used by DOT. A series of documents and templates are used to define, approve, monitor and control each project. Different templates are used based on the type of project. Manny advised that they require a lot of milestones to be defined in order to monitor and control the project schedule. DOT uses the PPM tool exclusively for status reporting and monitoring of projects. The tool is used by all levels of management for this purpose; additional status reports are not used. Manny indicated that “jelly beans” are used to solicit attention to projects from sponsors and senior managers in order gain resources, etc. as needed to make their projects successful. A pro-active approach to keeping management informed on projects experiencing problems works well in their agency.
2	<b>Other discussion topics:</b> <b>Jelly Beans</b> – discussion took place regarding the current “jelly bean” process and how it could be improved by involving the Project Manager earlier in the process. Distribution of alert letters needs to be revisited. We will continue this discussion at our meeting next week.  <b>Status Report Formats</b> – Lucy, Greg and Dick provided feedback/examples on improvements to the monthly status reporting format. These will be distributed to the rest of the team for review. The team discussed the need for more graphical reporting capabilities that depicts the status of the project as a whole. Jim Tulenko advised that if a recommendation was made to change the current format, we would need to pay a consulting fee to UMT to develop. A suggestion was made to allow each agency to provide status reports via their own project management tools as long as a standard format was followed.

	<p>Lucy suggested that an abbreviated check list in addition to the current status reporting process document would be helpful. Greg advised that his agency would benefit for a more detailed document to include both data entry and content instruction, since his group does not have to complete PPM tool status reports on a consistent basis.</p> <p><b>Status Report Audience</b> – the team needs to validate the audience for the required EPMO monthly status reports.</p>
3	<p><b>“Top 10” problems/issues identified with current process:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Difficulties with using the PPM tool/overall inflexibility</li> <li>2. Tool should measure triple constraints (scope, cost, schedule) but currently does not measure these accurately</li> <li>3. Project schedule measurement is “time consumption” rather than an “earned value” type metric</li> <li>4. Under utilization of resources is viewed as a negative</li> <li>5. Need to more clearly define milestones to make them more meaningful</li> <li>6. PPM tool does not accommodate the conceptual phase of a project, thus when the project meets the criteria to be input into the tool, the level of detail required may be difficult to capture and the PM must complete a number of “catch up” status reports</li> <li>7. PPM tool does not accommodate other development methodologies such as “Agile”</li> <li>8. Cannot see appropriate detail in current tool status report i.e. detail on issues and risks</li> <li>9. Limited capacity for comments and ability to reference historical information</li> <li>10. Resource management is not integrated into UMT tool. Difficult to accurately reconcile time for all resources.</li> </ol>
	<p><b>Project Approach &amp; Updates:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Define audience for monthly status reports –<i>representative agencies have defined the audience status reports are prepared for in their agency; we need to validate the audience for the required EPMO monthly status report</i></li> <li>• Define elements that should be included in status reports</li> <li>• Define/evaluate status codes (red, green, yellow, etc.) and alerts</li> <li>• Collect example reports already in use – <i>in progress</i></li> <li>• Formulate recommendations – identify “quick wins” and long term requirements</li> </ul>

## Action Item Updates

1	Validate audience for EPMO monthly status reports – Gaye will discuss with Sharon Hayes